

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Ex Parte Huang et al.

Application for Patent

Filed: April 07, 2004

Serial No.: 10/709,006

Group Art Unit: 2624

Examiner: MOTSINGER, SEAN T

For:

CIRCUIT AND METHOD OF DECOMPRESSING IMAGE

REPLY BRIEF

JIANQ CHYUN Intellectual Property
Attorneys for Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	1
3.	THE EXAMINER’S ANSWER IS IMPROPER.....	1
4.	CONCLUSION.....	3

1. INTRODUCTION

This Reply Brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed Jul. 8, 2009. Under 37 C.F.R. §41.41, it is believed that the Examiner's Answer is improper, and that this Reply Brief is therefore proper.

2. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment to the claim was filed after the Final Rejection.

3. THE EXAMINER'S ANSWER IS IMPROPER

The Examiner's Answer is improper. It is also respectfully believed that Examiner has fallen into personal judgment with hindsight. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's Answer for at least the reasons set forth below.

The decompressing process of Van Den Branden could be expressed as below:

(1) The system decoder 720 receives bitstream data and a determination is made as to whether the data is in the status of lost/corrupted/late. If so, the system decoder marks the data to indicate to the audio or video decoder 730, 740 that the information contained therein is in error.

(2) The audio or video decoder receives bitstream data transmitted by the system decoder and examines the marker bit of the first portion of bitstream data whether the first portion of bitstream data is erroneous or not.

(3) If the first portion of bitstream data contains no error, the audio or video decoder then decodes the first portion of bitstream data and checks the syntax of the audio and video bitstreams 727, 737 to detect the presence of lost or corrupted bitstream data.

(4) If the first portion of bitstream data is erroneous, the audio or video decoder then proceeds to enter the re-synchronization mode, which allows the audio or video decoder to search the audio or video bitstream data for the next syntactic unit of information that is not erroneous. Once this

portion of error-free bitstream data has been found, the audio or video decoder continues decoding and checking the syntax.

The Examiner interpreted the fourth step of the decompressing operation as *“Checking these marker bits is therefore a semantics and syntax precheck because it is checking for syntax and semantics errors flagged by the marker bits”* (pg. 12 of Examiner’s Answer). However, appellant submits that the interpretation was wrong. The process of “examining marker bits” is to determine whether the portion of bitstream data is in the status of lost/corrupted/late; it is different from “syntax and semantics per-check on the entire compressed image picture”.

Besides, in section of paragraph 70 (column 24 lines 18-29) relied upon by the Examiner *the syntax is not necessary because syntax errors were already checked in the precheck by examining the marker bits supplied by system decoder 720*. The Examiner further noted that *“if no errors are found in step 920 the system performs no further error checks are performed and the entire frame is decoded (i.e. suitable for decoding) because all the error checks were performed by examining the marker bits”* (pg. 13 of Examiner’s Answer).

Again, appellant submits that the interpretation of the Examiner was wrong. The audio or video decoder performs no further error checks only when it receives an error signal from the system decoder. The error check from the system decoder was checked piece by piece (*“each byte of audio and video bitstream data 727, 737 has an associated marker bit that indicates whether that byte of data contains errors”*, paragraph 60 column 20 lines 29-32) , that means the system decoder would continue syntax check from a portion of a frame data to the next until it finds an error in a particular portion. In the meantime, the audio or video decoder proceeds to decoding

the portion of bitstream data and checking the syntax until the portion received by the audio or video decoder contains an error.

Apparently, the decompressing process of Van Den Branden is not as the Examiner construed, i.e. *“if no errors are found in step 920 the system performs no further error checks are performed and the entire frame is decoded”*, and is definitely different from **“syntax and semantics per-check on the entire compressed image picture after the entire compressed image picture having been received”** as disclosed by the present invention.

4. CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons discussed in previous items, claims 1-12 are in proper condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Sept. 7, 2009

Belinda Lee
Belinda

Registration No. 46,863

Attorneys for Appellant
Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw